

## **Discussion of Possible Common Standards Site Visit Report Change October 2015**

### **Overview of this Report**

As part of the proposed plan to revise the accreditation system that is before the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation, the Site Visit Report for the Common Standards is another area to be reviewed that could potentially help streamline the process and provide concise information regarding the institution's ability to provide a strong support system for their programs.

### **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item and no action is needed at this time.

### **Background**

The Common Standards are standards that apply to the entire institution. Whether an institution has one program, such as induction, or all 51 programs that the Commission offers, there are certain standards that must be addressed to ensure that all programs have the support and resources required to run their programs effectively. The Commission will discuss, and possibly adopt, revisions to the current Common Standards at its October 2015 meeting. As part of the accreditation strengthening and streamlining project, it is appropriate to also discuss and consider other ways of documenting, through site visit reports, an institution's alignment with the Common Standards.

Currently, the Common Standards report, drafted by the site visit team, is a very technical and time-consuming report. It typically requires two to three Common Standards team members who devote an extensive amount of time to complete. In addition, in some cases, much of the information contained in the Common Standards report is duplicative of the program reports. For institutions with one program only, or two like programs such as General Education Induction and Education Specialist Induction, feedback from the COA and others have indicated that the Common Standards site visit reports are very similar regardless of institution.

Staff proposes that the COA consider the possibility of a template for a Common Standards site visit report. Staff prepared a possible template to assist in the discussion. This sample template is attached. In this particular example, the site visit team could be directed to ensure that every requirement of every common standard is being addressed, but allow them to write a more concise report that is not duplicative of the program reports and one that it is likely to be easily understood.

In the example in the attachment, every component of the standards is broken down, so that the team could decide if the institution met that portion of the standard consistently, inconsistently, or not at all. The team member would then write a very concise, (200 words or less), rationale as to how they met or did not meet the standard. At the end of the report there is an opportunity for the site visit team to describe the institution's strengths and/or

weaknesses in a concise overview. The institution, the COA, and members of the public would be able to see at a glance what areas of the Common Standards the institution has been determined to do well and where it needs improvement.

Some questions to assist in the discussion of this item follow:

- 1) Does the COA support the idea of changing the template for the Common Standards site visit report to be more less narrative driven?
- 2) If the COA supports the idea of developing a less narrative driven template, does the proposed template work? If not, what would the COA like to see in a template for future use? Do the terms consistent, not consistent, not present work for the COA.
- 3) Are there other thoughts related to the development of a Common Standards template?

After the COA discussion, staff will summarize the direction from the COA and move forward accordingly.

## Common Standards

Standard	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
<b>1. Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>			
<b>2. Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>			
<b>3. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>			
<b>4. Continuous Improvement</b>			
<b>5. Program Impact</b>			

### SUMMARY OF STANDARDS FINDINGS

#### Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The institution and education unit creates and articulates a research-based vision of teaching and learning.			
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making.			
Faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community.			
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program.			
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs.			
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity.			
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences.			
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.			

<b>Common Standard 1 Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>

### **Rationale**

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. (200 words maximum)

### **Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support**

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria.			
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California.			
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.			
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts.			
A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.			

<b>Common Standard 2 Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>

### **Rationale**

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. (200 words maximum)

### Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students.			
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites.			
Programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to experience issues of diversity.			
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.			
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.			
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in California public schools with diverse student populations.			

<b>Common Standard 3</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>			

#### Rationale

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. (200 words maximum)

#### Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data.			
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data.			

<b>Common Standard 4</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Continuous Improvement</b>			

#### Rationale

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. (200 words maximum)

#### Common Standard 5: Program Impact

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The unit and its programs demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students.			

<b>Common Standard 5</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met With Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Program Impact</b>			

#### Rationale

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. (200 words maximum)

#### INSTITUTION SUMMARY

Summarize the institution's operations, its strengths, and any areas of weakness. (300 words or less.)